

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are presently active in this case, Claim 10 having been amended by way of the present Amendment. Claims 1-9 have been indicated as being allowed.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubo (GB 2,326,050A). For the reasons discussed below, the Applicant requests the withdrawal of the anticipatory rejection.

Claim 10 of the present application recites a card attachment and detachment device holding detachably a card in a space defined between a body and a bottom plate. The device comprises a holder for being inserted into and removed from the space and having a card accommodation section accommodating the card, a lock member for holding the holder within the space, a release member for releasing the lock of the lock member, and a biasing member for forcing the holder toward a holder insertion and removal opening when the card is removed from the card accommodation section. The Applicant submits that the cited reference does not disclose all of the limitations recited in Claim 10.

The Kubo reference describes a portable telephone set (30) that includes a case (32, 34) and a card loading mechanism (51, 52). The Official Action cites element (52c-2a) for the teaching of the biasing member in Claim 10. The Kubo reference describes an engagement claw (52c-2) that has a slant surface (52c-2a) in the direction Y1, and a vertical surface (52c-2b) in the direction Y2. The Kubo reference describes the card holder (52) as being removed from the housing (51) by using the forefinger of an operator to engage handle

(52c-3), which bends the cantilever plate spring (52c) such that the engagement claw (52c-2) is disengaged from the central counter U-shaped frame portion (51a-4a). In the subsequent operation, the claw portion (52c-2) passes below the frame portion (51a-4a), so that the card holder (52) is drawn outside of the housing using only the forefinger. (See, for example, page 12, lines 8-13, and page 16, lines 14-34)

The Applicant submits that the Kubo reference does not disclose *a biasing member for forcing the holder toward a holder insertion and removal opening*, as recited in Claim 10 of the present application. The slant surface (52c-2a) of the engagement claw (52c-2) is not a biasing member for forcing the holder toward an opening. To the contrary, the Kubo reference appears to rely solely upon the forefinger of an operator in order to eject the holder from the housing. The slant surface (52c-2a) of the engagement claw (52c-2) is provided to aid in the insertion of the card holder (52) within the housing (51). (See, for example, page 18, lines 13-24.)

As the Kubo reference does not disclose all of the limitations recited in Claim 10 of the present application, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.


Claim 11 is considered allowable for the reasons advanced for Claim 10 from which it depends. This claim is further considered allowable as it recites other features of the invention that are neither disclosed, taught, nor suggested by the applied references when those features are considered within the context of Claim 10.

Application Serial No.: 10/049,294  
Reply to Office Action dated June 2, 2003

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward  
Registration No. 41,367



22850

Customer Number 22850  
Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf  
I:\atty\cdw\217881US3 PCT\am1.doc